REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Drawings

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether the drawings filed on March 14, 2004 are acceptable.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 1-58 were pending in this application. Claim 2, 30, and 31 are cancelled by way of this reply without prejudice or disclaimer. Of the currently pending claims, claims 1, 9, 29, 46, and 58 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 9, 29, 46, and 58.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 14-16, 28, 29, 32-58 are amended by way of this reply. Specifically, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 14-16, 28, 29, 32-58 have been amended to clarify the invention. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in the claims as originally filed, Figure 2 and Figure 3 and in paragraphs [0021], and [0046] - [0064] of the Specification. No new subject matter has been added by way of these claim amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 29-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed toward non-statutory subject matter. As discussed above, claims 30 and 31 are cancelled by way of this reply. Therefore, this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 30 and 31. To the extent that this rejection applies to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 29 and 32-57 have been amended to clarify that the computer system includes a processor and that various elements are executing on the processor. Therefore, claims 29 and 32-57 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2-4, 7, 9-28, 30-33, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. As discussed above, claim 2, 30, and 32 have been cancelled by way of this reply. Accordingly, this rejection is moot as to claim 2, 30, and 32. To the extent that this rejection applies to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is rejection is respectfully traversed.

35 U.S.C. § 112 requires that "[t]he specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention."

With regards to the rejection of claims 2, 9, 30-31, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2. Claim 29 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 30 and 32 and similar limitation as claim 2. The claims 2, 9, 10-13, 16-28, 30-32, and 33 are

rejected for having four situations but defining only three steps for three of the situations. Specifically, the claims stand rejected for omitting the fourth step for the forth situation, being, if the request is asynchronous and the kernel customer indicated not to queue the request and the request needs to be queued. *See* Office Action dated 7/31/2007, p. 2-6. Claim 1, 9, 29, 46, and 58, as amended, now recite that the request is queued when the request is asynchronous and the kernel consumer indicated not to queue the request, and the request needs to be queued. Accordingly, the claims are now complete with respect what happens when the request is asynchronous and the kernel customer indicated not to queue the request, and the request needs to be queued. Claims 1, 9, 29, 46, and 58 are therefore complete as to the omission cited by the Examiner. Thus, claims 1, 9, 29, 46, and 58, as amended, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and, accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

With regards to the rejection of claims 3 and 14 stand rejected for not defining the situation in which queue resources are not available and the request is synchronous. Claims 3 and 14 have been amended to include the possible actions that may occur when the request is synchronous and queue resources are unavailable. Specifically, the kernel consumer may or may not be notified for a synchronous request. *See, e.g.*, paragraph [0021] of the Specification. Thus, claims 3 and 14, as amended, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and, accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 14 is respectfully requested.

With regards to the rejection of claims 4 and 15 stand rejected for not defining the situation in which the request is synchronous. Claims 4 and 15 have been amended to include the possible actions that may occur when the request is synchronous. As discussed above, the kernel consumer may or may not be notified for a synchronous request. Therefore the kernel customer

may or may not be registered to receive notification for a synchronous request. *See, e.g.*, paragraph [0021] of the Specification. Thus, claims 4 and 15, as amended, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and, accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, and 15 is respectfully requested.

With regards to claim 7, claim 7 stands rejected for not specifying in which context the request is performed when the request is synchronous. Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites in part, "performing the cryptographic function in a kernel consumer context when the request is synchronous." Thus, the claims 1 and 7 now clarify the context for performing synchronous (*see* claim 1) and asynchronous requests (*see* claim 1). In view of the above, claim 7 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and, accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

With regards to claims 10-13 and 16-28, claims 10-13 and 16-28 are dependent on claim 9. Claims 10-13 and 16-28 have been rejected for not remedying the omission of claim 9. As discussed above, claim 9 has been amended to correcting the omission cited by the Examiner. Therefore, claim 9 is now complete and, as such, claims 10-13 and 16-28 are now complete as to the omission cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 10-13 and 16-18 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-13 and 16-28 is respectfully requested.

With regards to claim 32 and 33, the Examiner asserts that claims 32 and 33 omit the scenario as to what happens when the request is not queued. In particular, whether a handle is returned to the kernel customer. Claim 32 is amended to recite "wherein the encryption framework is not configured to return a handle to the kernel consumer when the request is not queued." In view of the above, claim 32, as amended addressed the previously omitted scenario. Thus, amended

claim 32 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 33, which is dependent on claim 32 now satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for at least the same reasons as amended claim 32. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 32 and 33 is respectfully requested.

Finally, claim 52 has been amended to correct the insufficient antecedent basis for the term "context template." Accordingly, claim 52, as amended satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 52 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, and 29-58 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,120,799 ("Leung") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,301,331 ("Ueno"). Claims 30 and 31 are cancelled by way of this reply. Accordingly, the rejection is moot with respect to claims 30 and 31. To the extent that this rejection applies to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2. Independent claims 9, 29, 46, and 58 have been similarly amended. As claim 2 was not rejected under the cited prior art, claim 2 is allowable over the cited prior art. Therefore, claims 1, 9, 29, 46 and 58, which incorporate the limitations of claim 2 are allowable over the cited prior art. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/336001; P8935).

Dated: October 31, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

By   /Robert P. Lord/
    Robert P. Lord
    Registration No.: 46,479
    OSHA · LIANG LLP
    1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
    Houston, Texas 77010
    (713) 228-8600
    (713) 228-8778 (Fax)
    Attorney for Applicants